

## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 3-5, 9, 15, and 16 are requested to be cancelled.

Claims 6, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, and 20 are currently being amended.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 6, 7, 10-14, and 17-20 are now pending in this application.

On November 17, 2006 a Final Office Action was issued rejecting claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,566,915 (Hansare). Claims 1 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,077,373 (Hoebener et al). However, the Examiner indicated that claims 5-7 and 9-13 were allowable over the prior art, but were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claims 16-20 were allowed. In order to advance the prosecution of the present application, and in reliance on the Examiner indication of allowability, Applicants submitted an amendment on March 9, 2007 canceling claims 1 and 8 and rewriting objected-to claims 5, 6, 9 and 12 and 15 to in independent form, including all of the limitations of the previously-presented rejected base claims. Lastly, claims 3 and 14 were amended to be dependent upon allowable claims 5 and 9, respectively.

Applicants' representative and the Examiner had a telephonic interview on March 29, 2007. The Examiner informed the Applicants' representatives that the after-final amendment was received and that a response would be forthcoming. Despite numerous telephone messages

left by Applicants' representative for the Examiner (all of which went unanswered), no response was received prior to May 17, 2007, the six month deadline for response to the Final Office Action. For this reason, Applicants had no choice but to file a Request for Continued Examination on May 17<sup>th</sup>.

Following the Applicants' Request for Continued Examination, the Examiner issued a new Office Action on June 5, 2007 and withdrew the indicated allowability of claims 5, 9, 15, and 16 in light of a newly cited reference, U.S. Pat. No. 3,358,957 (the "Lindenmuth reference"). The Examiner also newly rejected claims 3-7 and 9-20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for allegedly failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 3-5, 9, 14-16, 18, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated the Lindenmuth reference. However, the Examiner indicated that claims 6, 12, and 13 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under §112. The Examiner further indicated that claims 7, 10 11, 17, and 20 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under §112 and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

In order to advance the prosecution of the present application, and in order to place the present application in condition for allowance, Applicant has cancelled claims 3-5, 8-9, 15, and 16. Claims 6, 7, 10-13, 17, and 20 have been amended to overcome the rejections under §112. In particular, the Applicants have amended the claims to clarify that the claims are directed to the system alone. Independent claims 6, 10, 12, and 17 have been amended to recite "for attachment to an underside of a body having a planar surface" as suggested by the Examiner. Dependent claims 7, 11, 13 and 20 are been amended to depend from claims 6, 10, 12 and 17, respectively. Thus, the §112 rejection to those claims has also been addressed. Lastly, claims 14 and 18-19 were amended to be dependent upon allowable claims 13 and 17, respectively. Therefore, Applicants request the rejection of claims 6, 7, 10-13, 17 under §112 be withdrawn. In addition, because claims 14 and 18-19 are now dependent upon a claim that the Examiner has deemed to be allowable, Applicant submits that the Examiner's §102 of these claims must be

withdrawn. Because each of claims 6, 7, 10-14, and 17-20 are now in a form indicated to be allowable by the Examiner, or are dependent upon such an allowable claim, Applicants submit that each of these claims is now in condition for allowance.

In making the above amendments, Applicants are not taking a position as to the Examiner's interpretation of the claims and the prior art at issue. As such, Applicants fully reserve the right to continue pursuing the rejected claims in a subsequent continuation application. Given the history of the present application and the Examiner's previous withdrawal of her indication of allowability of several claims, if the Examiner has any questions concerning this issue or any others in the present case, she is strongly encouraged to contact the Attorney for Applicant before any new Office Action is issued.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date Sept 4, 2007

By Marshall J. Brown

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 27433  
Telephone: (312) 832-4358  
Facsimile: (312) 832-4700

Marshall J. Brown  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 44,566